

REMARKS

In an office action dated March 25, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 10-12, 21-23, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Marsland (US Patent 6,047,124). Claims 3-9, 13-20 and 24-27 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but otherwise indicated allowable.

Applicant has amended claims 3, 13 and 24 by re-writing these claims in independent form, including all the limitations previously contained in the respective claims from which they depended. Since these claims were objected to solely as dependent on rejected base claims, and indicated to contain patentable subject matter, amended claims 3, 13 and 24 are now allowable. Claims 4-9, 14-20 and 25-27, being dependent on claims 3, 13 and 24, respectively, are also patentable. Applicants have additionally changed the dependency in claims 21, 28 and 29, so that these depend from claim 13 or 24, and claims 21, 28 and 29 are accordingly patentable.

Claims 2, 12, 22 and 23 have been cancelled, and the rejections thereof are moot.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to overcome the rejection thereof. Amended claim 1 incorporates certain matter previously recited in dependent claims 2 and 3 (claim 3 containing allowable subject matter), but does not incorporate the whole of claim 3. Specifically, amended claim 1 recites setting up a data exception handler by (a) installing the data exception handler into a vector of an interrupt table, and (b) registering "data used to determine when the data exception is to be taken" in a data exception database table. Amended claim 1 does not contain the specific recitations of claim 3 concerning constituents of the "data used to determine when the data exception is to be taken". New claim 30, dependent on claim 1, contains additional limitations concerning the character of this data.

Notwithstanding that amended claim 1 does not explicitly recite that “data used to determine when the data exception is to be taken” contains target addresses, lengths, and callback routines, the essential steps of the method, i.e., installing the data exception handler in an interrupt vector, and registering data used to determine when the data exception is to be taken in the data exception database table, is recited in claim 1.


Marsland discloses a tracing technique for tracing the operation of device drivers, in which a tracing device driver executes within the operating system kernel, and interfaces with a tracing process executing in the user memory space. The tracing process controls the tracing device driver, according to a defined interface protocol, receives command from a user, and displays results to a user. While *Marsland* discloses interrupts generally, there is no showing of significant limitations in amended claim 1. I.e., according to amended claim 1, a data exception handler that emulates a target device is installed in an interrupt vector, and the trap conditions are registered in a data exception database table. These features allow considerable flexibility in programming the exception handler, which is not dependent on a set of fixed, pre-coded addresses for referencing the emulated device. These features are not taught or suggested by *Marsland*, and as amended claim 1 is accordingly patentable. Claims 10, 11 and 30, being dependent on claim 1, are also patentable.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all claims. In addition, the

Examiner is encouraged to contact applicant's attorney by telephone if there are outstanding issues left to be resolved to place this case in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS H. TRAN

By: 

Roy W. Truelson
Registration No. 34,265

Telephone: (507) 289-6256

Docket No.: RO999-187
Serial No.: 09/521,275